

App. No. 09/489,596
Amendment B
Page 7

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1 through 20 were previously canceled. Claims 21 and 24 have been amended. Twenty-seven claims are pending in the application: Claims 21 through 47.

Summary of Examiner Interview

1. A telephonic Examiner Interview was held on August 27, 2003 between Examiner Johnny Ma, Examiner John Miller and Thomas F. Lebens. No exhibits were shown or presented during the interview. Claims 21-47 were discussed with regard to both of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 (*Brodsky* and *Portuesi*). The Examiner suggested the claim amendments as made herein. Applicants and the Examiners agreed that neither *Brodsky* nor *Portuesi* taught or suggested a "receiving a keyword associated with the video image." Additionally, it was agreed upon that the URL of *Portuesi* was not the same as Applicants' "keyword."

35 U.S.C. §102

2. Claims 21-23, 26-28, and 45-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,809,471 (*Brodsky*).

Brodsky teaches a system in which a user is able to select from a group of words in a stored vocabulary list and then retrieve information from a CD-ROM database relating to the selected word. The group of words is locally generated by an extractor and then is put into a stored vocabulary list. The

App. No. 09/489,596
Amendment B
Page 8

extractor generates the words from, e.g., the closed caption text of a TV signal. Brodsky is a system that generates a word list from a received TV signal, and does not separately receive a separate keyword associated with the TV signal. The Brodsky word list, once locally generated, is accessed separately from the TV signal. In Brodsky, the only relation to the TV signal is that the word list was extracted from the TV signal. Brodsky however, fails to teach or suggest the separate step of "receiving a keyword associated with the video image" in accordance with Applicants' invention.

As suggested by the Examiner during the Examiner Interview on August 27, 2003, Applicants have amended claim 21 to recite "receiving a keyword associated with the video image." Applicants' amended claim 21 and claim 45 now both recite "receiving a keyword associated with the video image." Applicants submit that Brodsky does not teach or suggest Applicants' "receiving a keyword associated with the video image."

Brodsky generates its vocabulary list, which can be accessed by a user. The vocabulary list is generated from the TV signal, after the TV signal is received. Thus, there never is the receipt of "a keyword associated with a video image," such as is claimed by Applicants.

Advantageously, in one embodiment of Applicants invention, the provider of the TV signal is able to supply a specific keyword that is associated with a video image. In contrast, Brodsky simply teaches a means for generating words after receipt of a TV signal, wherein there is no association with the video image.

App. No. 09/489,596
Amendment B
Page 9

As is such Applicants respectfully submit the rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

3. Claims 21-24, 26-35, 37-41, and 43-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,499,057 (*Portuesi*).

The Examiner has equated a URL to be the equivalent to a keyword (Page 7 of Final Office Action).

As agreed with the Examiner during the Examiner interview and as stated in the specification of Applicants' application a "keyword" is not the same as a URL. "By using keywords, a very wide search of a network may be conducted than with simply a uniform resource locator (URL)" (See Page 19 of Applicants' specification). Thus, Applicants' "keyword" is not simply a URL as previously asserted by the Examiner. Therefore, *Portuesi* does not disclose "a keyword associated with a video image" such as is claimed by Applicants.

All of the rejected claims include a "keyword" or are dependent upon a claim that includes a "keyword." As is such, Applicants respectfully submit the rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §103

4. Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. Patent No. 5,809,471 (*Brodsky*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,819,284 (*Farber et al.*).

As stated above with reference to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102, *Brodsky* does not teach "receiving a keyword associated with the video image." Applicants further submit the combination of *Brodsky* and *Farber et al.* do not teach "receiving

App. No. 09/489,596
Amendment B
Page 10

a keyword associated with the video image." As is such, Applicants respectfully submit the rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

5. Claims 24, 29-35, 37-41, and 43-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. Patent No. 5,809,471 (Brodsky) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,499,057 (Portuesi).

As described above with reference to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102, Brodsky does not teach "receiving a keyword associated with the video image." Additionally, Portuesi does not disclose the "keyword" of Applicants' invention. Applicants further submit the combination of Brodsky and Portuesi do not teach "receiving a keyword associated with the video image." As is such, Applicants respectfully submit the rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

6. Claims 36 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. Patent No. 5,809,471 (Brodsky) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,499,057 (Portuesi) further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,819,284 (Farber et al.).

As described above with reference to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102, Brodsky does not teach "receiving a keyword associated with the video image." Additionally, Portuesi does not disclose the "keyword" of Applicants' invention. Applicants further submit the combination of Brodsky, Portuesi and Farber et al. do not teach "receiving a keyword associated with the video image." As is such, Applicants respectfully submit the rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

App. No. 09/489,596
Amendment B
Page 11

7. Claims 25, 36, 42 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,499,057 (*Portuesi*).

As described above with reference to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102, *Portuesi* does not disclose the "keyword" of Applicants' invention. Furthermore, *Portuesi* does not teach or suggest "receiving a keyword associated with the video image." As is such, Applicants respectfully submit the rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

App. No. 09/489,596
Amendment B
Page 12

C O N C L U S I O N

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and prompt and favorable action is earnestly solicited. Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Thomas F. Lebens at (805) 781-2865 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin R. Bader
Reg. No. 54,736

Dated: November 10, 2003

Address all correspondence to:

FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
Thomas F. Lebens
120 South LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600
Chicago, IL 60603
(805) 781-2865